THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

Writ Petition No.8015 of 2005

05-10-2005

Between:

APSRTC, rep. By its Managing Director, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

... PETITONER

AND

The State Transport Appellate Tribunal, Manoranjan Complex, M.J.Road, Nampally, A.P., Hyderabad rep. By its Presiding Officer and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

–

Writ Petition No.8015 of 2005

ORDER:

Heard both sides.

This writ petition is filed by the A.P. State Road Transport Corporation questioning the order, dated 07.07.2004, made in R.P.No.289 of 2003 on the file of the State Transport Appellate Tribunal, A.P., Hyderabad (for short, the Tribunal) which was filed against the order, dated 19.12.2002, passed by the Regional Transport Authority, Nellore, whereunder the third respondent has been granted pucca Stage Carriage permit on the Town Service route-from Kalakarula Colony to Zakir Hussain Nagar.

It is to be noted that R.P.No.289 of 2003 was dismissed following the Full Bench decision of this Court in **APSRTC v State Transport Appellate Tribunal**, wherein it was held that there was no prohibition for grant of permits to ply town services though the route in question overlaps on the notified mofussil route.

When the matter is taken up for consideration, it is brought to my notice by the learned counsel for both the parties that during the pendency of this writ petition, a Constitutional Bench of the Supreme Court in **APSRTC v Regional Transport Authority and another**, reversed the said decision of the Full Bench of this Court holding that under Exception 2 contained in the Note appended to the Scheme permits can be issued only to the existing town services operating in the notified routes which means only existing operators on the notified routes are eligible for permits and fresh applicants or future

applicants are totally ineligible for granting permits for town services operating on notified routes.

It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that since the revision petition was dismissed by the Tribunal without going into the merits of the case, the matter requires reconsideration on merits. The learned counsel for the respondents does not dispute the same. It is stated that as a matter of fact, a batch of writ petitions have already been disposed of remanding the matters to the Tribunal for consideration afresh.

Accordingly, the impugned order, dated 07.07.2004, passed in R.P.No.289 of 2003 by the Appellate Tribunal is set aside and the writ petition is allowed remanding the matter to the Appellate Tribunal for consideration afresh on merits and to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law after hearing both sides. No costs.

_____

05.10.2005

VGB